



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,503	02/27/2004	Maneesh Agrawala	M61.12-0607	7428
27366 7590 02/05/2009 WESTMAN CHAMPLIN (MICROSOFT CORPORATION) SUITE 1400 900 SECOND AVENUE SOUTH MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402				
EXAMINER				
FABER, DAVID				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2178				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
02/05/2009		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Commissioner for Patents
United States Patent and Trademark Office
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

**BEFORE THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS
AND INTERFERENCES**

Application Number: 10/788,503
Filing Date: February 27, 2004
Appellant(s): AGRAWALA ET AL.

Leanne Taveggia Farrell

For Appellant

EXAMINER'S ANSWER

This is in response to the appeal brief filed 6 November 2007, and the supplement appeal brief filed on 17 December 2008 appealing from the Office action mailed 23 February 2007.

(1) Real Party in Interest

A statement identifying by name the real party in interest is contained in the brief.

(2) Related Appeals and Interferences

The examiner is not aware of any related appeals, interferences, or judicial proceedings which will directly affect or be directly affected by or have a bearing on the Board's decision in the pending appeal.

(3) Status of Claims

The statement of the status of claims contained in the brief is correct.

(4) Status of Amendments After Final

The appellant's statement of the status of amendments after final rejection contained in the brief is correct.

(5) Summary of Claimed Subject Matter

The summary of claimed subject matter contained in the brief is correct.

(6) Grounds of Rejection to be Reviewed on Appeal

The appellant's statement of the grounds of rejection to be reviewed on appeal is correct.

(7) Claims Appendix

The copy of the appealed claims contained in the Appendix to the brief is correct.

(8) Evidence Relied Upon

6594348	Bjurstrom et al	7-2003
20020107888	Chiu et al	8-2002
6912326	Lai et al	6-2005

5708825	Sotomayor	1-1998
6226655	Borman et al	5-2001
20010052000	Giacalone, Jr.	12-2001
WO 03083717 A1	Buckley et al	10-2003

Tanenbaum, Andrew S., "Modern Operating Systems", 2001, Prentice Hall, 2nd Edition, pp 132-151

(9) Grounds of Rejection

The following ground(s) of rejection are applicable to the appealed claims:

Claims 1-6, 14-16, 20-25, 27-28, 31, 33-34, and 37-39 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al (US Patent #6,594,348, patented 7/15/2003) in further in view of Chiu et al (US PGPub 2002/0107888, published 8/8/2002) in further in view of Buckley et al (WIPO WO 03/083717A1, published 10/9/2003).

As per independent Claim 1, Bjurstrom et al discloses a method comprising:

- Converting components in a hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags (Column 7, lines 25-60: Discloses a browser retrieving an HTML page consisting of a number of page elements, parsing the HTML page to create an object model that is a one-to-one mapping of the document, and creating a dialogue state structure with the voice browser controller, that adds dialogue elements to the model in which the elements contain input, output and references to the object model position properties.

Column 8, line 52 – Column 10, line 67: discloses different inputs that are incorporated to controlling the browser and their functionality.)

- activating the converted components in the hypertext document by receiving input signals related to the alternate component activation tag from the different portable input devices. (Column 9, line 20-30: When a key is pressed, DTML tone, or signal is sent to browser for the corresponding functionality of the pressed key to occur. Column 5, lines 38-52; Column 6, lines 35-43: discloses the tones are audio signals used from a phone to a DTMF receiver. FIG 1, Column 5, lines 48-51 discloses an input device. Furthermore, Bjurström et al discloses that voice browsers were developed for users that wish access information from a web page or WWW content through a telephone. Thus, it is implied it is inherent that each user uses their own telephone (FIG 1; Column 5, lines 50-53) to access information when a user uses Bjurström et al's voice browsing system.)

However, Bjurström et al fails to specifically disclose controlling a display module to display the alternative component activation tag with the convert component in the hypertext document and activating the converted component in the hypertext document displayed on the display module by receiving an input signal related to the alternate component activation tags from at least one of a plurality of portable input devices operated by one of the plurality of users that are viewing the display module.

However, Chiu et al discloses a system for browsing online using numeric keys wherein a displayed document containing plurality of hyperlinks is edited to including a correspond number to the plurality of hyperlinks, wherein the updated document is displayed with the corresponding number next to its corresponding hyperlink. In addition, a user uses an input device, e.g. remote controller, to select numbers that will triggers input actions that would cause the loading of the selected hyperlink or related function key onto the display. (Paragraph 0007, 0017-0020, 0025-0028, 0033; FIG 3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's method with Chiu et al's method since Chiu et al's method would have provided the benefit enabling a user to be able to browse online navigating document by using numeric keys.

However, Bjurstrom and Chiu et al fail to specifically disclose controlling a shared display module... wherein the shared display module is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device. However, Buckley et al discloses a shared display screen simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users (FIG1; Page 4, lines 9-11) of which users are interacting simultaneously with their own input device. (FIG 6B-6D; Page 9, line 30 – Page 10, line 5: Discloses different embodiments of users simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device being PDAs (Page 1, lines 27-30))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's method and Chiu et al's method with Buckley et al's ability for users to interact with their own device and for the users to

be able to view a shared display since it provides the benefit of allowing users interact with on their own device independently which has the ability to share information among a shared environment by allowing user send their information to a shared display, and allowing users to retrieve the information from the shared display.

As per dependent claim 2, Bjurstrom et al discloses a method further comprising:

- parsing the hypertext document to identify hyperlinks and open fields (Column 7, lines line 29-30, 35-45: parsing the document that results in a parse tree structure with all page elements, which includes links and input fields (line 29-30))

As per dependent claim 3, Claim 3 recites similar limitations as in claim 1, and is similar rejected under rationale. Bjurstrom et al discloses of being able to process different types of input signals from a portable input devices which the browsing system can recognize; (Column 9, lines 20-47: A user has a number of input selections to select from the portable input device used (telephone) wherein each input is a signal that comprises a certain functionality, thus a different type of signal from the portable input device. Therefore, an input occurs, transmitted to a receiver in the browser, browser processes and performs the corresponding functionality of that input)

As per dependent claim 4, Bjurstrom et al discloses a method further comprising:

- activating the converted components by receiving alphanumeric symbola that represent the alternate component activation taga. (Column 9, lines 20-30: An example disclosing using the number '7', an alphanumeric symbol, as an

input. Column 9, line 30 – Column 10, line 67 discloses other alphanumeric symbols used and their functionalities.)

As per dependent claim 5, Claim 5 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and is similar rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Bjurstrom et al discloses a method further comprising:

- providing a plurality of browsing modes to perform various navigational commands; (Browser that dedicated to HTML application functions (Abstract, lines 5-8), which include back, forward, go to start page, menu (Column 9, lines 35-47)
- modifying the plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags; and activating a particular browsing mode by receiving an input signal related to a particular alternate browsing activation tag that is associated with the particular browsing mode from at least one of the portable input devices operated by one of the plurality of users. (Column 7, line 60 – Column 10, line 67: Discloses various browser functions implemented to be operated by inputs that when inputted activate the corresponding functionality. Inputs include inputs that are intended for HTML application functionality and the operations performed by the voice browser are determined from the action specified by the HTML application for the particular DTMF tone interpretation. (column 7, line 45-51) Pressing certain keys assigned to keys are inputted include perform returning to previously

view HTML page (Column 10, lines 17-22), and going to the start (home) page. (Column 10, lines 49-54)

Furthermore, based on the rejection of Chiu et al and the rationale incorporated within, Bjurstrom edits the content to include an alternative tag include the operations of the plurality of browsing modes, thus using Chiu et al's method, the display would include the modified content, e.g. a number, that corresponds to a particular functions wherein a user operates a input device to activate the particular function.

As per dependent Claim 6, Bjurstrom et al discloses a method comprising:

- activating the browsing modes by receiving alphanumeric symbols that represents the particular alternate browsing activation tag. (Column 9, lines 20-30: An example disclosing using the number '7', an alphanumeric symbol, as an input. Column 9, line 30 – Column 10, line 67 discloses other alphanumeric symbols used and their functionalities.)

As per dependent Claim 14, Bjurstrom et al fails to specifically discloses annotating the hypertext document with a unique code such that the input signal is associated with the hypertext document. However, Chiu et al discloses the ability to display a web page with hyperlinks displaying corresponding numbers next to the hyperlink so the user can operate function keys using numeric keys to access the links. (Paragraph 0027-0030) Thus, this feature annotates the document for the number to be placed next to the hyperlink in the document wherein each number is a form of a unique code representing a corresponding input function to that hyperlink. Each number is

different, shown in FIG 3, therefore each number represents a different link, and a different input to make it unique.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to have combined Bjurstrom et al's method with Chiu et al's method since Chiu et al's method would have provided the benefit enabling a user to be able to browse online navigating document by using numeric keys.

As per independent claim 15, Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Claims 1 and 5, and similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent Claim 16, Bjurstrom et al discloses a method comprising:

- activating the browsing modes by receiving alphanumeric symbols that represents the alternate browsing activation tags. (Column 9, lines 20-30: An example disclosing using the number '7', an alphanumeric symbol, as an input. Column 9, line 30 – Column 10, line 67 discloses other alphanumeric symbols used and their functionalities.)

As per dependent Claim 20, Claim 20 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent Claim 21, Claim 21 recites similar limitations as in Claim 4, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per independent Claim 22, Claim 22 recites a system for performing the method of Claim 1 and is rejected similarly under rationale. Furthermore, Bjurstrom et al discloses an input processor configured to receive and process input signals. (Column 9, lines 23-29: a DTMF receiver, or processor, receives a DTMF tone that was inputted

by one of the users using their phone and interpreted into a readable execution that can be read by the voice browser to execute the functionality corresponding the input.)

As per dependent Claim 23, Bjurstrom et al discloses a method wherein the input signals received by the input processor are associated with alphanumeric symbols. (Column 9, lines 20-30: An example disclosing using the number '7', an alphanumeric symbol, as an input. Column 9, line 30 – Column 10, line 67 discloses other alphanumeric symbols used and their functionalities.)

As per dependent Claim 24, Bjurstrom et al discloses a method wherein output data to of the different input devices. (column 5, lines 54-56) However, Bjurstrom et al fails to disclose an output module to receive data from the hypertext display controller. However, Chiu et al discloses a communications protocol that used to send data to a display output such as a television to be displayed. (Paragraph 0026-0028)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's method with Chiu et al's method since Chiu et al's method would have provided the benefit enabling a user to be able to browse online navigating document by using numeric keys on a TV.

As per dependent claim 25, Claim 25 recites similar limitations as in Claim 3, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent Claim 27, Bjurstrom et al discloses a method comprising cell phones (FIG 1; Column 5, lines 50-53)

As per dependent Claim 28, Claim 28 recites similar limitations as in Claim 5 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent Claim 31, Bjurstrom et al and Chiu et al fail to specifically the shared displayed comprises multiple screens. However, Buckley et al discloses the display screen may be divided into a number of segments or display areas (screens). (Page 4, lines 12-15; Page 5, lines 19-26) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's method and Chiu et al's method with Buckley et al's shared display to be divided into multiple frames or screens since it would have provided the benefit of sharing multiple documents or pages at a time among user that saves performance time when only sharing one document or page a time.

As per independent claim 33, Claim 33 recites similar limitations as in Claims 1 and 5 combined, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent Claim 34, Bjurstrom et al discloses a variety of navigational controls for browsing through hypertext documents. (Browser that dedicated to HTML application functions (Abstract, lines 5-8), which include back, forward, go to start page, menu (Column 9, lines 35-47, Column 10)

As per dependent Claim 37, Claim 37 recites similar limitations of Claim 1, and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per independent Claim 38, Bjurstrom et al discloses a computer-readable medium comprising:

- Converting components in a hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags represented by symbols (Column 7, lines 25-60:
Discloses a browser retrieving an HTML page consisting of a number of page

elements, parsing the HTML page to create an object model that is a one-to-one mapping of the document, and creating a dialogue state structure with the voice browser controller, that adds dialogue elements to the model in which the elements contain input, output and references to the object model position properties. Column 8, line 52 – Column 10, line 67: discloses different inputs of symbols that include numbers that are incorporated to controlling the browser and their functionality.)

- activating the converted components by receiving and processing input signal from the different portable input devices. (Column 9, line 20-30: When a symbol, that includes number, is pressed, DTML tone, or signal is sent to browser for the corresponding functionality of the pressed symbol to occur. Column 5, lines 38-52; Column 6, lines 35-43: discloses the tones are audio signals used from a phone to a DTMF receiver. Furthermore, Bjurström et al discloses that voice browsers were developed for users that wish access information from a web page or WWW content through a telephone. Thus, it is implied it is inherent that each user uses their own telephone (FIG 1; Column 5, lines 50-53) to access information when a user uses Bjurström et al's voice browsing system.)

However, Bjurström et al fails to specifically disclose controlling a display module to display the symbols representing the converted components in the hypertext document and activating the converted components by receiving and processing input signals

related to the symbols from the different portable input devices operated by one of the plurality of users that are viewing the display module.

However, Chiu et al discloses a system for browsing online using numeric keys wherein a displayed document containing plurality of hyperlinks is edited to including a correspond number to the plurality of hyperlinks, wherein the updated document is displayed with the corresponding number next to its corresponding hyperlink. In addition, a user uses an input device, e.g. remote controller, to select a number that will triggers an input action that would cause the loading of the selected hyperlink or related function key onto the display, such as a television. (Paragraph 0007, 0017-0020, 0025-0028, 0033; FIG 3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's method with Chiu et al's method since Chiu et al's method would have provided the benefit enabling a user to be able to browse online navigating document by using numeric keys.

However, Bjurstrom and Chiu et al fail to specifically disclose controlling a shared display module... wherein the shared display module is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device. However, Buckley et al discloses a shared display screen simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users (FIG1; Page 4, lines 9-11) of which users are interacting simultaneously with their own input device. (FIG 6B-6D; Page 9, line 30 – Page 10, line 5: Discloses different embodiments of users simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device being PDAs (Page 1, lines 27-30))

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's method and Chiu et al's method with Buckley et al's ability for users to interact with their own device and for the users to be able to view a shared display since it provides the benefit of allowing users interact with on their own device independently which has the ability to share information among a shared environment by allowing user send their information to a shared display, and allowing users to retrieve the information from the shared display.

As per dependent Claim 39, Claim 39 recites similar limitations as in Claims 1 and 5 and is similarly rejected under rationale. Furthermore, Bjurstrom discloses computer-readable medium comprising:

- modifying the plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags; each alternate browsing activation tag represented by a symbol and activating browsing modes by receiving and processing a particular symbol. (Column 7, line 60 – Column 10, line 67: Discloses various browser functions implemented to be operated by input symbols that when the input symbol is pressed, it activates the corresponding functionality. Inputs include inputs that are intended for HTML application and the operations performed by the voice browser are determined from the action specified by the HTML application for the particular DTMF tone interpretation. (column 7, line 45-51) Pressing certain keys assigned to various symbols that include by numbers are inputted include perform returning to previously view

HTML page (Column 10, lines 17-22), and going to the start (home) page.
(Column 10, lines 49-54)

Claims 7, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al (US Patent #6,594,348, patented 7/15/2003) in further in view of Chiu et al (US PGPub 2002/0107888, published 8/8/2002) in further in view of Buckley et al (WIPO WO 03/083717A1, published 10/9/2003) in further view of Lai et al (US Patent #6,912,326, filed 5/21/2002).

As per dependent Claim 7, Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al fail to specifically disclose further comprising abbreviating the hypertext document such that display space needed in displaying the hypertext document is reduced. However, Lai et al discloses reducing an electronic document display to be able to view documents on small, portable devices wherein the size of the reduced document width. (Abstract, Column 2, lines 56-61)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art the time of Appellant's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al with Lai et al's method since Lai et al's method would have provided the benefit that a reduced document can be displayed on the screen of the digital portable devices such that larger and more understandable portion of the original document can be viewed by the user, while the visual quality is preserved.

As per dependent Claim 9, Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, Buckley et al, and Lai et al fail to specifically disclose automatically reducing the image media content in the

hypertext document. However, since Lai et al method functions based on an algorithm that reduces the document as a whole based on pixel information, without losing visual quality, (Column 1, line 60- Column 2, line 30; FIG 5) it would have obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention that text and image content would be automatically reduced and displayed at a reduced scale within the displayed reduced sized document since it would have provided the ability provide documents with reduce images sizes so images even set for bigger screens doesn't overlap text or other images on images on portable devices with smaller screens.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al (US Patent #6,594,348, patented 7/15/2003) in further in view of Chiu et al (US PGPub 2002/0107888, published 8/8/2002) in further in view of Buckley et al (WIPO WO 03/083717A1, published 10/9/2003) in further view of Lai et al (US Patent #6,912,326, filed 5/21/2002) in further view of Sotomayor (US Patent #5,708,825, patented 1/13/1998).

As per dependent Claim 8, Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, Buckley et al, and Lai et al fail to specifically disclose abbreviating the hypertext document comprises automatically summarizing text in the hypertext document. However, Sotomayor discloses a summary page generator that scans textual data in a document and creates a summary of the page. (FIG 3; Column 8, line 26 – Column 9, line 10) In addition, Column 11, lines 35-63 discloses the different types of summary pages created.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to have combined Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, Buckley et al, and Lai et al's method with Sotomayor's method since Sotomayor's method would have provided a method of page summary generation that would provide a page describing key topics for easy viewing for quicker recognition about a document.

Claims 10-13, 17-19, 29, 35-36, and 40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al (US Patent #6,594,348, patented 7/15/2003) in further in view of Chiu et al (US PGPub 2002/0107888, published 8/8/2002) in further in view of Buckley et al (WIPO WO 03/083717A1, published 10/9/2003) in further view of Borman et al (US Patent #6,226,655, filed 5/1/2001).

As per dependent Claim 10, Claim 10 recites similar claims as in Claim 1 and 5 and is similarly rejected under rationale. However, Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al fail to disclose that browsing modes to perform various navigational controls were automated browsing modes. However, Borman et al discloses an animated tour of an automatic navigation of web pages stored in a list. The method loads the first page in a browser window from the list automatically. Then after a time delay, a new page is loaded automatically from the list. This automated process continues until all the pages listed in the list have been viewed or the user terminates the process. (Column 3, lines 30-50) In addition, Borman et al discloses other automated browsing modes on retrieving files without traversing in reverse order of site identifiers selected. (Column 3, line 51-Column 4, line 19)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's, Chiu et al's method and Buckley et al's method with Borman et al's method since Borman et al's method would have provided the benefit of users saving time and effort in finding information on the Internet.

As per dependent Claim 11, Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al fail to specifically disclose deactivating the particular automated browsing mode by receiving a command from one of the plurality of input devices. However, Borman et al discloses during the animated tour process, (Column 3, lines 30-50) the user can terminated the animation by using the stop timer button. (Column 7, lines 15-16)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's, Chiu et al's method and Buckley et al's method with Borman et al's method since Borman et al's method would have provided the benefit of providing operational control for navigation the Internet based on the user's preferences.

As per dependent Claim 12 and 13, Claim 12 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10, and is similarly rejected under rationale. Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al fail to disclose activating the particular automated browsing mode by receiving an input signal related to a particular automated browsing activation tag associated with the particular automated browsing mode from at least one of the portable input devices operated by one of the plurality of users, where in the receiving an alphanumeric symbol that represents the automated browsing activation tag.

However, based on the rejection of Claims 1, 5, and 6 incorporated, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to have used Bjurstrom et al's input methods with automated browsing since it would have provided the benefit of users with visual problems to be able to operation advance automated features in browsers using various input devices.

As per dependent Claim 17, Claim 17 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10, and is similar rejected under rationale.

As per dependent Claim 18 and 19, Claim 18 and 19 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10, and is similarly rejected under rationale. Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al fails to disclose activating the particular automated browsing mode by receiving an input signal related to a particular automated browsing activation from at least one of the portable input devices operated by one of the plurality of users, where in the receiving an alphanumeric symbol that represents the automated browsing activation tag. However, based on the rejection of Claims 1, 5, and 6 incorporated, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to have used Bjurstrom et al's input methods with automated browsing since it would have provided the benefit of users with visual problems to be able to operation advance automated features in browsers.

As per dependent Claim 29, Claim 29 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent Claim 35, Claim 35 recites similar limitations as in Claim 10 and is similarly rejected under rationale.

As per dependent Claim 36, Borman et al discloses the use of continuous use of scrolling and cycling through documents, previewing of documents, and browsing of hyperlinks listed by the user. (Abstract, Column 3, lines 23-50) Borman et al allows the users to activate a tour of all the web sites that been saved in a list that goes through all the pages scrolling and cycling each of the page, showing a preview of each page listed in the link list. The user can specify how the delay between each preview of the pages show, and when to stop the automatic browsing of the hyperlinks (Column 3, lines 23-50) In addition, Borman et al's method is able to automatically randomly choose a link from the list after one has been selected. Its chooses the first link, the link prior to one shown, the next after shown, or the last link on the list. (Column 3, lines 18-22)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have combined Bjurstrom et al's, Chiu et al's, and Buckley et al's method with Borman et al's method since Borman et al's method would have provided the benefit of users saving time and effort in finding information on the Internet.

As per dependent claim 40, Claim 40 recites similar limitations as in Claims 10 and Claim 39 combined, and is rejected under rationale.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al (US Patent #6,594,348, patented 7/15/2003) in further in view of Chiu et al (US PGPub 2002/0107888, published 8/8/2002) in further in view of Buckley et al (WIPO WO 03/083717A1, published 10/9/2003) in further view of Tanenbaum (Tanenbaum, "Modern Operating Systems, copyrighted 2001, pgs 132-.151)

As per dependent claim 26, Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al fails to specifically disclose implementing a scheduling algorithm to process the input signals in the order. However, Tanenbaum discloses the use of scheduling algorithms that schedules which process to run next. Tanenbaum discloses scheduling algorithms that could be used such as shortest job first, and first-come first served. (pp 132-151)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have combined Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al's method with Tanenbaum since Tanenbaum would have provided the benefit of enabling processes to be processed in a specific order within a processor.

Claim 32 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bjurstrom et al (US Patent #6,594,348, patented 7/15/2003) in further in view of Chiu et al (US PGPub 2002/0107888, published 8/8/2002) in further in view of Buckley et al (WIPO WO 03/083717A1, published 10/9/2003) in further view of Giacalone, JR. (US PGPub 2001/0052000, filed 12/13/2001).

As per dependent Claim 32, Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al fail to specifically disclose the shared displayed includes a status display indicating status and historical information related to the input signal from the plurality of input devices. However, Giacalone, JR discloses a display controller that maintains an exact log of piece of content presented to the display where it transmitted to a database. Additional data from other system controllers are stored in the database that can be queried for statistical analysis. (Paragraph 0015, 0036, 0044)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to have used Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al's methods with Giacalone, JR's method since Giacalone JR's method would have provided the benefit of providing a summary of information of information used for determining future advertising and financial purposes

(10) Response to Argument

In regards to Appellant's argument on pages 9-10 in reference to Claim 1 and its parallel independent claims 22 and 38, Appellant argues that none of the references fail to teach or suggest, expressly, or impliedly all of the elements of claim; in particular, the claim limitation, "activating the converted components in a hypertext document on the shared display module (which is viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device) by receiving input signals related to the alternate component activation tags from the different portable input devices." Furthermore, Appellant argues that the input signals from different portable input devices in which the signals were from the interaction with by the users. However, the Examiner disagrees.

First, based on the claim limitation, "the shared display module is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with different portable input devices", the claim language discloses the view of which a plurality of users have the ability to view a shared display at the same time while interacting with their own input device. However, the claim language does not necessary state it discloses that when the users are interacting with there devices, they

are interacting with the shared display module. It only states the shared display module is viewable at the same time the users are interacting with their own user devices. In addition, the claim language does not specifically disclose that interacting is affecting the shared display module when the users are interacting. It just discloses the users are interacting with the input device wherein the interacting is not fully defined within the claim language. Interacting with the input device could mean turning it off and on or changing the device settings which has no affect on the shared display module based on the claim language.

Second, the Appellant argues from the limitation "activating the converted components in a hypertext document on the shared display module by receiving input signals related to the alternate component activation tags from the different portable input devices" that the input signals are from the users when the users were interacting with the portable input device. However, the claim limitation does not necessary disclose the input signals are from the device when the users are interacting with the device or that they are user created input signals using the device. Furthermore, it appears, based on the claim language, that the claim limitation does not necessary disclose all of the devices are sending signals at once; just that signals are coming from a portable input device at one time. Therefore, it does not necessary say that the input signals from the different portable input devices were from the interaction with by the users. The Appellant only assumes it says it in the claim.

Thus, based on the claim language of the claim limitation, the cited references teach all of the claim elements including the specific limitations the Appellant is arguing.

Bjurstrom et al teaches the limitation of converting components in a hypertext document to include alternate component activation tags. Column 7, lines 25-60, Bjurstrom discloses a browser retrieving an HTML page consisting of a number of page elements, parsing the HTML page to create an object model that is a one-to-one mapping of the document, and creating a dialogue state structure with the voice browser controller, that adds dialogue elements to the model in which the elements contain input, output and references to the object model position properties. Furthermore, in Column 8, line 52 – Column 10, line 67, Bjurstrom discloses different inputs, also viewed as symbols that include numbers, that are incorporated to controlling the browser and their functionality.

Next, Bjurstrom teaches the limitation of activating the converted components by receiving and processing input signal from the different portable input devices. Bjurstrom et al discloses Column 9, line 20-30, wherein when a key, that includes number, is pressed, DTMF tone, or signal is sent to browser for the corresponding functionality of the pressed symbol to occur. Furthermore, Column 5, lines 38-52 and Column 6, lines 35-43 discloses the tones are audio signals used from a phone to a DTMF receiver. In addition, Bjurstrom et al discloses that voice browsers were developed for users that wish access information from a web page or WWW content through a telephone. Thus, it is implied it is inherent that each user uses their own telephone (FIG 1; Column 5, lines 50-53) to access information when a user uses Bjurstrom et al's voice browsing system.

Thus, Bjurstrom discloses the ability for hypertext documents to be edited to include alternate activation components tags wherein users using a telephone have the

ability to use the phone to activate the alternate component tags within the document by pressing a key on the phone that sends a signal to the document to activate the component containing the alternative tag.

However, Bjurstrom et al fails to specifically disclose controlling a display module to display the alternative component activation tag with the convert component in the hypertext document and activating the converted component in the hypertext document displayed on the display module by receiving an input signal related to the alternate component activation tags from the different portable input devices.

However, Chiu et al discloses a system for browsing online using numeric keys wherein a displayed document containing plurality of hyperlinks is edited to including a correspond number to the plurality of hyperlinks, wherein the updated document is displayed with the corresponding number next to its corresponding hyperlink. In addition, a user uses an input device, e.g. remote controller, to select numbers that will triggers input actions that would cause the loading of the selected hyperlink or related function key onto the display. (Paragraph 0007, 0017-0020, 0025-0028, 0033; FIG 3)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's method with Chiu et al's method since Chiu et al's method would have provided the benefit enabling a user to be able to browse online navigating document by using numeric keys.

In addition, Chiu et al discloses the display may be a television (Paragraph 0028); however, Bjurstrom et al and Chiu et al fail to specifically disclose a shared display module... wherein the shared display module is simultaneously viewable by a

plurality of users. It was well-known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention that two or more users may view a television at the same time wherein one of the users at a time operates the television using a remote, thus making the television a shared display module viewed by a plurality of users.

Thus, Chiu et al discloses a shared display module that has the ability to display hypertext documents that contain alternate components activation tags such as numbers that when a user using a portable input device (remote) presses a number on it, it sends a signal to the document being displayed on the television (viewable by multiple users) in which the signal activates the alternate tag in the converted components wherein the activation is reflected to the television to be viewed by multiple users.

However, Bjurstrom and Chiu et al fail to specifically disclose controlling a shared display module... wherein the shared display module is simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users of which each user is simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device. However, Buckley et al discloses a shared display screen simultaneously viewable by a plurality of users (FIG1; Page 4, lines 9-11) of which users are interacting simultaneously with their own input device. (FIG 6B-6D; Page 9, line 30 – Page 10, line 5: Discloses different embodiments of users simultaneously interacting with a different portable input device being PDAs (Page 1, lines 27-30)) In addition, Buckley discloses the ability for users to change the shared display from their own device. (Page 1, lines 27-30; Page 4, lines 16-20, Page 5, lines 5-14) Thus, Buckley discloses the ability of multiple users interacting with different portable input devices

wherein at the same time having the shared displayed be viewable by the users. In addition, the users have the ability to change the shared display module from their own different portable input device, wherein each user has their own different PDA.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have modified Bjurstrom et al's method and Chiu et al's method with Buckley et al's ability for users to interact with their own device and for the users to be able to view a shared display since it provides the benefit of allowing users interact with on their own device independently which has the ability to share information among a shared environment by allowing user send their information to a shared display, and allowing users to retrieve the information from the shared display. In addition, the shared display provides the opportunity for plurality of users to web browse the Internet as one by allowing each person from each of their input device to display web pages (hypertext document) onto the shared display wherein the other users have the ability to view the web pages at the same time. Therefore, there is motivation to combine Buckley with Bjurstrom and Chiu et al.

Thus, overall, Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al discloses the claim limitations based on the claim language interpreted.

In regards to Appellant's argument on page 11 in reference to Claim 15 and its parallel claim 33, Appellant argues similar arguments in reference to Claim 1 since Claim 15 recites similar limitations as in Claim 1 and the response to the similar

arguments are stated above in reference to Claim 1. Furthermore, Bjurstrom et al discloses the limitations involving browsing modes. Bjurstrom et al discloses providing a plurality of browsing modes to perform various navigational commands wherein Bjurstrom discloses the browser is dedicated to HTML application functions (Abstract, lines 5-8), which include back, forward, go to start page, menu (Column 9, lines 35-47). In addition, Bjurstrom et al discloses the limitation "modifying the plurality of browsing modes to include alternate browsing activation tags"; and "activating a particular browsing mode by receiving an input signal related to a particular alternate browsing activation tag that is associated with the particular browsing mode from at least one of the portable input devices operated by one of the plurality of users", wherein Column 7, line 60 – Column 10, line 67, discloses various browser functions implemented to be operated by inputs that when inputted activate the corresponding functionality. Inputs include inputs that are intended for HTML application functionality and the operations performed by the voice browser are determined from the action specified by the HTML application for the particular DTMF tone interpretation. (column 7, line 45-51) Pressing certain keys assigned to keys are inputted include perform returning to previously view HTML page (Column 10, lines 17-22), and going to the start (home) page. (Column 10, lines 49-54)

Furthermore, based on the rejection of Chiu et al and the rationale incorporated within, Bjurstrom edits the content to include an alternative tag include the operations of the plurality of browsing modes, thus using Chiu et al's method, the display would

include the modified content, e.g. a number, that corresponds to a particular functions wherein a user operates a input device to activate the particular function.

In regards to Appellant's argument on pages 13-14 in reference to Claim 10 and its parallel claims 17, and 40, Appellant argues the cited references fail to teach or suggest "controlling the shared display module to display the automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags to the plurality of users, wherein Examiner fails to show that the shared display module is controlled to display automated browsing modes and automated browsing activation tags with the use of Borman et al. However, the Examiner disagrees.

In response, Appellant must discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them. Furthermore, since the Appellant fail to present arguments that discuss the references applied against the claims, and explain how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them, the Examiner respectfully ask the Appellant to refer to the claim rejections pasted below.

Claim 10 recites similar claims as in Claim 1 (response to arguments disclosed above) and 5 and is similarly rejected under rationale. However, Bjurström et al and Chiu et al fail to disclose that browsing modes to perform various navigational controls were automated browsing modes. However, Borman et al discloses an animated tour of an automatic navigation of web pages stored in a list. The method loads the first page in

a browser window from the list automatically. Then after a time delay, a new page is loaded automatically from the list. This automated process continues until all the pages listed in the list have been viewed or the user terminates the process. (Column 3, lines 30-50) In addition, Borman et al discloses other automated browsing modes on retrieving files without traversing in reverse order of site identifiers selected. (Column 3, line 51-Column 4, line 19) Thus, Borman et al discloses displaying automated browsing modes, thus, in conjunction with Bjurstrom and Chiu, allowing automated browsing modes, and automated browsing activation tags.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant's invention to have combined Bjurstrom et al's and Chiu et al's method with Borman et al's method since Borman et al's method would have provided the benefit of users saving time and effort in finding information on the Internet.

In regards to Appellant's argument on pages 15 in reference to Claim 26, Appellant argues the cited references fail to teach or suggest " he input processor is further configured to process different types of input signals received from the different portable input devices in an order", wherein Examiner fails to show that the processing different types of input signals et along in an order with the use of Tannenbaum when the Examiner cited the scheduling algorithms in Tannenbaum that schedules which process to run the next based on various factors, such as shortest job first or first come first served. However, the Examiner disagrees.

In response, Appellant must discuss the references applied against the claims, explaining how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them. Furthermore,

since the Appellant failed to present arguments that discuss the references applied against the claims, and explain how the claims avoid the references or distinguish from them, the Examiner respectfully ask the Appellant to refer to the claim rejections pasted below.

Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al fails to specifically disclose implementing a scheduling algorithm to process the input signals in the order. However, Tanenbaum discloses the use of scheduling algorithms that schedules which process to run next. Tanenbaum discloses scheduling algorithms that could be used such as shortest job first, and first-come first served. (pp 132-151) Tannenbaum discloses algorithms such as shortest job first, and first come first served that reorder the elements (signals) based on credentials used by each algorithm. Based on the algorithm credentials, each algorithm determines which elements should be processed first, second, third, etc... and reorders those element into the order that was previously determined in which the elements are processed in that order.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Appellant 's invention to have combined Bjurstrom et al, Chiu et al, and Buckley et al's method with Tanenbaum since Tanenbaum would have provided the benefit of enabling processes to be processed in a specific order within a processor.

All other arguments on pages 9-15 referring to the dependent claims and parallel claims are in reference to the topics above, thus the rationale above can be used to respond to the similar arguments.

(11) Related Proceeding(s) Appendix

No decision rendered by a court or the Board is identified by the examiner in the Related Appeals and Interferences section of this examiner's answer.

For the above reasons, it is believed that the rejections should be sustained.

Respectfully submitted,

/David Faber/

Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Conferees:

/Stephen S. Hong/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2178

Stephen Hong, Supervisory Patent Examiner for Group Art Unit 2178

/DOUG HUTTON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2176